

Appl. No. 10/037,707  
Reply to Office action of May 12, 2004

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-2, 6-15 and 19-30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. 6,586,925 to Ramesh *et al.* (Ramesh '925). Claims 3-5 and 16-18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramesh '925. In particular, the Examiner alleges, as represented by claim 1, that Ramesh '925 discloses a docking system comprising a handler plate (device handler plate 10), mountable to said device handler [not shown] and comprising at least one conversion bar (roller assembly 14), each of said at least one conversion bar (14) comprising at least one lateral protrusion (roller bearing 15); and a tester plate (test head plate 12), mountable to said test head [not shown] and comprising at least one slot mount (receiver block assembly 20), each of said at least one slot mount (20) having an escalating slot (cavity 24), said escalating slot (24) being laterally oriented for respective linear engagement with said at least one lateral protrusion (15) for said docking. This allegation is not supported by Ramesh '925. Therefore, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections for the following reasons.

Appl. No. 10/037,707  
Reply to Office action of May 12, 2004

“A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). “The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ...claim.” *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Here, after careful review of the cited prior art, Applicant respectfully submits that Ramesh ‘925 fails to teach or suggest the claimed invention because of fundamentally different principles and numerous different features between the claimed inventions and the cited prior art.

One exemplary claimed feature as represented by claim 1 is the slot mount comprising an escalating slot that is laterally oriented for respective linear engagement with one lateral protrusion for the docking system. The Examiner alleges that the slot mount (receiver block assembly 20) has an escalating slot (cavity 24). For the reasons below, Applicant respectfully submits that Ramesh ‘925 fails to teach or suggest the escalating slot as claimed in the present invention because the

Appl. No. 10/037,707  
Reply to Office action of May 12, 2004

claimed escalating slot is fundamentally different from the cavity 24 as disclosed by Ramesh '925.

The escalating slot 50 as claimed in the present application comprises a tapered section 72 and a docking section 74. The tapered section 72 comprises a linear sloping edge 76 and a linear non-sloping edge 78. The linear non-sloping edge 78 is linearly aligned with a linear docking edge 80 of the docking section. The tapered section 72 comprises a connecting portion 82 for enabling substantially linear movement of the lateral protrusion 40 from the unbounded perimeter portion 70 to the linear non-sloping edge 78. See, page 8, lines 20-27; and FIG. 7. It is to be appreciated that the claimed escalating slot can be employed in both manual and automatic docking system. When a manual docking system is employed, moving the cam handle 90 moves the coupling rod 32 such that the escalating slot 50 gradually engages the lateral protrusion 40 along the linear sloping edge 76 of the tapered section until the lateral protrusion 40 is positioned at the docking section 74. See, page 8, line 30 to page 9, line 4. When an automatic docking system is employed, the connecting portion 82 enables substantially linear movement of the lateral protrusion 40 from the unbounded

Appl. No. 10/037,707  
Reply to Office action of May 12, 2004

perimeter portion 70 to the linear non-sloping edge 78. This linear movement is critical for automatic docking system because automation mechanisms typically operate based upon linear movement. See, page 9, lines 23-29.

In contrast, Ramesh '925 discloses a sliding block 26 having a cavity/groove 46 (not the cavity 24 as the Examiner alleged) with a slope 47. See, column 7, lines 28-65; FIG. 2a and FIG. 2b. The dimension of the slope 47 of the cavity/groove 46 is suitable for manual docking system as illustrated by FIG. 4, FIG. 5, and FIG. 6. Also see, column 8, line 61 to column 9, line 42. However, the cavity/groove 46 cannot be employed in an automated docking system. As discussed above, automation mechanisms typically operate based upon linear movement. It is apparent that the cavity/groove 46 with the slope 47 as disclosed in Ramesh '925 cannot support any linear movement within it. Thus, the docking mechanism disclosed in Ramesh '925 cannot be employed in an automated docking system. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 of the present application is not anticipated by or made unpatentable in view of Ramesh '925.

Appl. No. 10/037,707  
Reply to Office action of May 12, 2004

While the foregoing discussion has been focused on claim 1, the same arguments apply to the remaining claims (claims 2-30) because all the remaining claims are dependent ones upon claim 1 or the ones having narrower scopes than that of claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-30 are not anticipated by or made unpatentable in view of Ramesh '925.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
LAWRENCE N. GINSBERG,  
Attorney for Applicant, Reg. No. 30,943

8/10/04

DATE

21 San Antonio  
Newport Beach, CA 92660-9112  
Tel. - 949-640-6261